

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 4 through 15, 29, 32 through 44, 58, and 60 are pending, with Claims 29 and 60 being independent. Claims 1 through 3, 30, and 31 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 4 through 15, 29, 32 through 41, and 58 have been amended. Claim 60 has been added. The specification and Abstract have been amended.

The Abstract was objected to. All objections are respectfully traversed, and are submitted to have been obviated by the amendment of the Abstract in a manner earnestly believed to avoid the grounds of objection.

Claims 5, 6, 33, and 34 were objected to and indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants have retained such claims in dependent form, as it is earnestly believed by Applicants that the claims from which they depend will be found to be allowable.

Claims 4, 32, and 58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite. All rejections are respectfully traversed, and are submitted to have been obviated by the amendment of the claims in a manner earnestly believed to avoid the grounds of objection, viz, the objected-to expressions have been deleted.

Claims 1 through 4, 7 through 15, 29 through 32, 35 through 44, and 58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 or 103 over US 6,618,549 B1 (Kato, et al.), taken alone or in view of US 6,115,057 (Kwoh, et al.) and Applicant's Allegedly Admitted Prior Art. All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 29 and 60 recite, *inter alia*, if the access level changes between successive first packets of the data stream, the entry node... reduces the size of the second packet preceding the synchronization second packet such that the start of the payload information of the synchronization second packet corresponds to the start of a first packet associated with the new access level.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that none of Kato, et al., Kwoh, et al., and Applicants' Allegedly Admitted Prior Art, even in the proposed combinations, assuming, *arguendo*, that such could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 29 and 60.

The Official Action relies, at page 6, upon Kato, et al.'s col. 9, lines 4-14 and Fig. 4. Applicants respectfully traverse such reliance. Applicants respectfully submit that such relates to, e.g., adding a source packet header of 4 bytes to a 188-byte transport packet of a transport stream to form a 192-byte source packet, but that such bears no relation to the above-discussed claimed features. Applicants note that Kato, et al.'s Fig. 13 discloses, e.g., 187 bytes which are the bytes of a transport packet excluding a byte of the sync_byte at the head of the transport packet, but Applicants respectfully submit that this too fails to constitute a description or a suggestion of at least the above-discussed claimed features.

Applicants further respectfully submits that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at such features.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel S. Glueck/
Daniel S. Glueck
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DSC/gjr

FCIS_WS 2467832v1